

**Corrections Standards Authority (CSA)
SB 81 Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility
Construction Funding Program
June 23, 2008 Feedback Session**

MEETING MINUTES

**THE FEEDBACK SESSION WAS
CHAired BY:**

Linda Penner, Chair
Fresno County Chief Probation Officer
CSA Board Member
Adele Arnold, Co-chair
Siskiyou County Chief Probation Officer
CSA Board Member

LOCATION:

Sacramento Police Training Facility
570 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95811

TIME CONVENED:

1:05 pm

TIME ADJOURNED:

1:35 pm

Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) Staff:

C. Scott Harris, Executive Director; **Leslie Heller**, Field Representative; **Charlene Aboytes**, Field Representative; **Melinda Ciarabellini**, Field Representative; **John Kohls**, PhD., Corrections Consultant; and **John Berner**, PhD., Corrections Consultant

MINUTES PREPARED BY: **Charlene Aboytes**, CSA Field Representative

I. Welcome and Introductions

Committee Chair, Linda Penner welcomed the group and began the meeting by introducing C. Scott Harris, Executive Director, Corrections Standards Authority. Self introductions by the Chair, Co-chair and CSA staff followed.

Ms Penner indicated that the purpose of this meeting was a feedback session; an opportunity for interested persons to ask questions related to the draft SB 81 Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility Construction Program Request for Proposals (RFP) that was released June 11, 2008. It is anticipated that the final RFP will be released shortly after the July 10 CSA Board meeting.

II. Goals of Today's Meeting

Field Representative **Charlene Aboytes** provided background regarding the SB 81 Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility Construction Program and discussed the tentative timeline for the process.

III. The following individuals provided feedback.

Bill Fenton, Deputy Chief Probation Officer, Alameda County:

Would demolition costs be included in the acquisition/preparation of a site and be considered part of the allowable “soft match costs”?

The RFP states that there is a June 30, 2017 deadline for funding. Is there a date for when project completion is to be done?

The eligible projects section in the RFP states that “Counties may not build for future capacity needs beyond the year 2013.” However, renovation and deferred maintenance projects will not be allowed unless they extend the life of the facility for 35 years or more. This seems contradictory.

Kevin Carruth, representing Kitchell CEM:

The term “construction completion” does not have a definition. It would be helpful to have this term defined considering that counties must operate the facility within 90 days of construction completion.

The RFP contains a requirement that counties must complete their project “...within budget.” It seemed to be an odd requirement for the RFP.

The RFP requires that if a project is federally funded, it can't be funded with lease-revenue bonds. The same issue exists if the project is currently bond funded (or any similar funding mechanism).

The RFP and the typical construction project flow chart addresses the environmental reporting requirements. Case law regarding CEQA states that project design should not go beyond the schematic design phase without completing the CEQA process because you cannot prejudice the site. He indicated that it was not a technical matter, but as a state agency it seems important that documents should be in complete compliance with CEQA requirements. At one time, CDCR was considering a CEQA expert by the name of Cathy Van Aiken. This would be a helpful resource.

In the definitions section, construction management is defined as eliminating risk. A construction manager will minimize, but not eliminate risk.

Anita Hopman, Mariposa County Probation Department:

A greater clarification regarding soft match requirements was requested, especially for small counties. The county sees this as one of the obstacles they face in finding ways to come up with sufficient match.

Subsequently, the following question was asked via e-mail. “What is the purpose of the cash match and why is it mandatory, especially for small counties?”

Will there be a minimum number of beds that must be constructed? (CSA staff responded that there will be no minimum number of beds that must be constructed because the RFP doesn't require that traditional juvenile hall or camp beds be constructed. The RFP allows for other types of facilities to be built.)

Don Meyer, Chief Probation Officer, Yolo County:

Counties have huge security concerns about transporting juveniles to existing courts. Does the RFP allow for joint powers agreements with courts or other agencies to build adjoining courtrooms to create justice centers?

He also asked about dual purpose facilities – such as custody and treatment centers – does the RFP allow for dual purpose facilities?

Doug Rieffel, Juvenile Hall Division Director, Monterey County:

Can counties partner with the state using state dollars to build courtrooms in addition to the juvenile facility? He was concerned about a possible conflict of interest.

The RFP indicates that county must fully staff the juvenile facility within 90 days from the date of construction completion and must complete the project within three years. If the project is completed within two years but built to 2013 needs, is it assumed that the facility must be fully staffed for that projected year? What if population needs do not reflect the need to be fully staffed?

There were no other questions.

Ms Aboytes indicated that the responses to these questions would be posted on the CSA's website in the form of Frequently Asked Questions, and staff will respond via e-mail to the attendees of the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1335 hours.